Pages 1 - 42

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER, JUDGE

IN RE: VOLKSWAGEN "CLEAN)
DIESEL" MARKETING, SALES) Master File No.
PRACTICES, AND PRODUCTS) 3:15-MD-02672-CRB
LIABILITY LITIGATION.) MDL No. 2672

San Francisco, California Thursday, February 25, 2016

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN Embarcadero Center West 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111

BY: ELIZABETH J. CABRASER, ESQUIRE DAVID S. STELLINGS, ESQUIRE

BOIES SCHILLER AND FLEXNER 333 Main Street Armonk, New York 10504

BY: DAVID BOIES, ESQUIRE

BLOCK & LEVITON LLP 492 Ninth Street, Suite 260 Oakland, California 94607

BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER, ESQUIRE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE Environment and Natural Resources Division

P.O. Box 7611

Washington, DC 20044-7611

BY: JOSHUA H. VAN EATON, TRIAL ATTORNEY

(Appearances continued on next page)

Reported By: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RPR, CRR

Official Reporter - U.S. District Court

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED):

For Volkswagen:

HERZFELD AND RUBIN, P.C.

125 Broad Street

New York, New York 10004

BY: JEFFREY L. CHASE, ESQUIRE

SULLIVAN AND CROMWELL LLP

125 Broad Street

New York, New York 10004

BY: ROBERT J. GIUFFRA, JR., ESQUIRE

For Defendant Porsche Cars North America:

ALSTON & BIRD, LLP

1201 West Peachtree Street Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3424

BY: CARI K. DAWSON, ESQUIRE

For defendant Robert Bosch GmbH and Robert Bosch LLC:

CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20006-1801

BY: MATTHEW D. SLATER, ESQUIRE

(Multiple counsel present in the courtroom as reflected in the minutes.)

Thursday - February 25, 2016 1 8:01 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 THE CLERK: Calling case 15-MD-2672, In re Volkswagen 4 and Clean Diesel Marketing Sales Practices and Products 5 Liability Litigation. 6 Counsel, please make your appearances. Please come 7 forward to the podium. 8 MS. CABRASER: Good morning, Your Honor. Elizabeth 9 Cabraser, Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, plaintiffs' lead 10 counsel. 11 THE COURT: Good morning. 12 MR. VAN EATON: Good morning, Your Honor. 13 Van Eaton for the United States. 14 15 THE COURT: Good morning. 16 MR. GIUFFRA: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert 17 Giuffra, Sullivan and Cromwell, defendants' liaison counsel. 18 MR. CHASE: Good morning, Your Honor. Jeffrey Chase with Herzfeld & Rubin, defendants' liaison counsel. 19 20 THE COURT: All right. MS. DAWSON: Good morning, Your Honor. Cari Dawson, 21 Alston & Bird defense, liaison counsel. 22 23 THE COURT: Good morning. May I ask a question? I know you're defense liaison 24 25 counsel but you also have, sort of, a specialty here; right?

```
What is that? Who is your client?
 1
             MS. DAWSON: Porsche Cars North America, Your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. Thank you very much.
 3
             MR. SLATER: Your Honor, Matthew Slater, Cleary
 4
 5
     Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton, in Washington, D.C. I'll be
     appearing on behalf of Robert Bosch GmbH and Robert Bosch LLC.
 6
 7
     I'll be filing a pro hac vice motion imminently, but haven't
    had a chance to do that yet. Appreciate it if I could appear
 8
    here today.
 9
10
              THE COURT: Of course. Thank you very much. I know
11
     this is your first appearance.
12
             MR. SLATER: Yes.
13
              THE COURT: And you are counsel for Bosch. Is that
     it, essentially?
14
15
             MR. SLATER: Yes.
16
              THE COURT: They are appearing in the action.
17
    have been sued.
18
             MR. SLATER: To the extent that it's necessary to say
19
     so now, this will be a special appearance to preserve
20
     jurisdictional defenses, Your Honor. But we recognize this is
21
     important litigation. It's something the company takes very
22
     seriously. And we're here to engage and cooperate with this
23
    process, yes.
              THE COURT: I appreciate that.
24
25
             MR. SLATER:
                           Thank you.
```

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

I don't know whether I have -- there are a number of people on the phone, obviously, in CourtCall. And they, of course, can't see the fact that this courtroom is filled with the luminaries of the plaintiffs bar. Many are on the plaintiffs' steering committee.

And let me take this opportunity to thank those people who are on the plaintiffs' steering committee. It's extremely important that we put together a group of diverse but highly competent counsel representing a myriad of interests that will be evident in this case and necessary in this case. And I want to thank plaintiffs' counsel.

I also want to thank the defense counsel because I have received in the submission today -- and we'll talk about it in a moment -- a number of proposed pretrial orders dealing with discovery, dealing with scheduling, dealing with protective orders, dealing with a number of issues.

And it's clear to me that in this past month not only has the plaintiffs' steering committee prepared a -- well, I don't think I would say a thin complaint. I don't know how one wants to describe 751 pages.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: But produced a book. And it may be chapter 1.

Obviously, they worked very hard preparing the

consolidated complaint. But my appreciation goes further than that. It goes to the fact that plaintiffs' steering committee was able to sit down with the defense, and the defense with the steering committee, and work out a number of details which can be enormously time-consuming, which can form an impediment to proceeding. And they have simply been able to surmount any differences that I'm sure occur in every case and were discussed among the parties.

That's excellent because I think it's in the best interests of both the plaintiffs and their clients and the defense to proceed as efficiently and as expeditiously as possible in this litigation.

So let me go out of order, if I might, and address the issue which, to the Court's view, is the key issue to be addressed in this litigation at the outset, which is remediation; which is, what remedies are being proposed by Volkswagen to address the immediate problem of hundreds of thousands of vehicles on the streets and highways of the United States which are not in compliance with the law.

So, Mr. Giuffra, if you want to address that. Really, what I want to know is, as of today, where are we? And where are we with some specificity?

In other words, I know through Director Mueller that there have been a number of meetings, that people are engaged in the process. But I want to have -- to the extent you can respond

to this, I want to have a much more definite idea of where you are with respect to different classes of vehicles and where you are with, you know, this process at this time.

So tell me what you can.

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, again, we're very pleased with the fact that we were able to work everything out with the other side. And I think that's reflective of the fact that the goal of Volkswagen is to come up with a fair and prompt resolution of all of these matters. And we are obviously working very hard with all of the various stakeholders who are interested in this issue.

Now, we have been meeting -- and I have to be careful what I say only because, one, this is a public courtroom and also because we've been in very intense discussions with the Department of Justice, with the Environmental Protection Agency, and with the California Air Resources Board over a remedy.

And I think one important point to, sort of, say at the outset is that any remedy we propose has to meet the approval of the Environmental Protection Agency and the CARB. In fact, when one looks at the actual regulations, they provide very specific requirements for any kind of a car recall, fix, or anything else that we might do.

So unlike, for example, in the -- in the BP oil spill, where the company could go right to Mr. Feinberg, give

Mr. Feinberg money, and Mr. Feinberg could engage in his claims process, basically, the door for us providing a remedy means we must go through the EPA and CARB.

So what has been going on since we were last here is there have been multiple meetings in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere around the country involving senior folks from Volkswagen at the very highest level of the company, very senior folks at the Department of Justice, EPA, and CARB.

We've had working group meetings on various topics, including, number one, what would be the remedy for car owners; number two, what would be the approach in terms of remediating the environmental harm that was caused by these cars; and, number three, other issues that would be -- would be addressed in a possible resolution.

Now, Mr. Van Eaton who is here could also confirm this, that we've been advised by the Justice Department that they don't want us to engage in our negotiations and discussions over remediation in a public way. In fact, they've asked us not to do that. So I don't want to, sort of, cross them.

But I think I can give the Court the following basic points: Obviously, we're committed to resolving these matters as quickly as possible. And the company is obviously focused on rebuilding public trust, particularly with its customers.

These meetings have been going on. There are a number of options on the table. There are options with respect to what

particular generations of cars and how they would be treated.

There are discussions, again, about various forms of remediation. And then there are other issues that we're

discussing with the Department of Justice, EPA, and CARB.

These are highly complex engineering issues. And the engineers have been meeting, as well, because obviously the things EPA and CARB are concerned about is whether any resolution or remedy will be one that is a durable, lasting remedy. And those discussions are going on.

And there's very complicated issues regarding emission systems, onboard diagnostics. And all of that is being dealt with at the standpoint of the engineers.

Now, we've also been meeting with Director Mueller. Your Honor referenced that. And I can tell you I am personally speaking with Director Mueller multiple times a week. Director Mueller has met on several occasions with senior members of Volkswagen's board of management. He's met with Volkswagen's engineer who is responsible for this matter. He has been given a briefing -- confidential pursuant to Your Honor's orders -- on where the settlement discussions and resolution discussions stand.

We provided to Director Mueller copies of the documents that we provided to the Department of Justice, EPA, and CARB pursuant to Your Honor's confidentiality order. So Director Mueller has a pretty good idea of where the framework is for a

resolution.

We've also -- as Your Honor, I think, knows from prior hearings, we're obviously dealing with other stakeholders.

There are other government agencies that are interested in those issues. The company is cooperating with them and providing them with information.

Mr. Feinberg continues to develop his protocol. And I spoke to Mr. Feinberg last night. I probably speak to Mr. Feinberg twice a day, including on the weekends. And he is diligently working on the details of a protocol. He has met with company executives. He has received financial information from the company. He has looked at various options for a remedy.

And ideally what we would do here is, if we can do it -and that all depends on whether we can reach a resolution,
hopefully, through Director Mueller -- we would incorporate
that resolution in a court-ordered settlement. And
Mr. Feinberg would be the settlement administrator for that
process.

If we can't reach agreement with the plaintiffs but we can reach agreement with EPA and CARB, then we would go forward with Mr. Feinberg's protocol.

But, again, as I mentioned at the outset, the keys to a resolution here is getting EPA and CARB approval on a remedy.

And that's -- you know, it's along. We're making a lot of

progress. There were meetings last week, and there was a meeting yesterday in Washington, D.C.

One other point I should mention, it's important to remember that this matter involves 600-or-so-thousand cars in the United States. It involves another 11 million in the rest of the world and in more than a hundred countries.

So this is a very complex situation, where one has to deal with regulatory approvals outside the United States as well as inside the United States; although, the standards are different in different countries.

So that's a long way of me saying we're making progress.

My belief is that within a month or so I think we'll have

something more definitive to say to the Court.

The discussions are progressing. There are confidential discussions.

And we have provided Director Mueller with the details, for example, of the PowerPoints that have been exchanged with the Department of Justice, the EPA, and CARB. So he's fairly up to speed on the details of those discussions and the framework that we are working on with those agencies.

And, again, I've been told by DOJ, EPA, and CARB that we should not be talking publicly about the specifics of the framework that we're moving toward a remedy.

That may not be satisfactory to the Court --

THE COURT: Well, let me make a couple of observations

here.

First, you have described a process. And I accept that this process is going forward. And I accept that the parties are operating in good faith and exchanging information and trying to arrive at a resolution. And I understand that.

I don't think it's my role -- and I think it might be somewhat counterproductive if I were to try to get into the details of what that process is. That is, what exactly is being offered where -- you know, what are the considerations and so forth.

Number one, I don't have the expertise. Number two, it's not my role. That's the role of the government. And they have to be satisfied, given all the circumstances, that these vehicles and a proposed fix will be consistent with their goals in terms of policy and environmental concerns. That judgment is a judgment made by the United States government. It's not made by a district court judge. And I appreciate that.

On the other hand, I have some real concerns, and I want to voice them today.

First, unlike a number of cases or class actions, this is an ongoing problem. We are not -- we are not looking at a situation where the damage has been caused and what is the appropriate compensation for the damages.

If it were just that and you had a very complicated series of formulas to address that, I would certainly understand that

we could take a fair amount of time and whatever would be required to come to a rational, reasoned judgment as to the appropriate remedy.

But that's not this case. It may be part of this case, but it's not this whole case. And the reason it's not this whole case is, as you point out, 600,000 vehicles are on the road today, out of compliance with national EPA standards that -- in some cases, a heightened standard by, I think, eight states as well.

So it's an ongoing harm that has to be addressed. And that gives a sense of urgency. And it's not just that these vehicles on the road can't be sold or can't be crated. It's not just that. It is the fact that they are polluting; and, therefore, we must address it.

I am concerned about a couple of other things. I am concerned about, as the cliche goes, the perfect being the enemy of the good.

No one is looking to Volkswagen to come up with a perfect solution that answers all these problems. But there are solutions, perhaps, that can be addressed, that would be less than perfect but can be addressed with greater immediacy.

That is that, certain decisions may have to be made by the company that will not be the most -- let's see, not be the most advantageous economically for the company. But it's a decision that they must make in what I call the very near future.

And I want to be careful that the process not be confused with the result. That is, that you don't look at this thing and say, well, we're engaged in this process so let it just play out. Because I have found that process is a function of how much time people have available to fill.

The old story about lawyers is that, you know, if you give them a year to do something, it will take them a year to do something. If you give them 30 days to do something, they'll do something in 30 days. It may not be what they would have done in a year, but it will get done.

And so I want to tell Volkswagen that there are a couple of things that I want to accomplish.

First of all, I think that by March 24th, when I plan to have the next hearing in this matter, I want a definite answer from Volkswagen and EPA whether or not they've achieved a resolution of these vehicles, a remediation of these vehicles; whether they can do so technologically and within the parameters that EPA believes acceptable to them. But I want to know that before March 24th.

I think that this matter has gone on since -- at least we know that Volkswagen's knowledge of this process, that is, those people in the highest management and ownership positions were aware of it from at least September 18th. I don't know how much before that. I'm not interested in that point at this point, because it seems to me six months is long enough to

determine whether or not there is an engineering process that can be utilized by Volkswagen and would be acceptable to the United States government. And that's the amount of time I've given you. So I want to have a definite answer as to that question not later than March 24th.

In that process, I want Director Mueller to meet with what I consider to be the ownership and management, top ownership and management. So I want him to meet -- and he's willing to go to Germany -- with members of the management board and members of the executive committee of the supervisory board.

There are two boards, I understand, in the control and management of Volkswagen. I want a meeting to take place with members of those two groups and Director Mueller.

I want to make sure -- so you might ask: Why is that important? I'll tell you why, in my judgment, it's important.

Volkswagen is going to make decisions here. And those decisions are going to have serious consequences to the company. And I want to make sure that before they make their final decisions with respect to what they can do and what they cannot do, they understand -- at the highest levels, they understand the consequences of that decision.

I have complete faith in you, Mr. Giuffra, of being able to communicate that. I understand that. But there's a big difference between a lawyer saying something, who's been hired to represent their interests and give their judgment, and have

```
someone like the settlement master appointed by the Court to
talk to them about it. And, of course, you would be present.
And, of course, it would be confidential.
```

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, if I could just -- actually, just to give you some more information, Director Mueller has met with management board members of Volkswagen on two separate occasions within the last month. He's also met within the last month with the lead engineer who's actually working on the fix. He's been given, literally, slide PowerPoints describing the technical aspects of the fix.

THE COURT: That's fine. But I want him to meet with the executive committee of the supervisory board.

MR. GIUFFRA: That can be arranged.

THE COURT: That's what I want.

MR. GIUFFRA: That can be arranged.

THE COURT: I want it to be at that level.

Because, you see, I don't know and nor should I know how companies operate. Every company is a little bit different. There are all sorts of forces that go into decision-making processes by owners, and all sorts of concerns.

And as you correctly point out, this is a 600,000-car problem here, and it's an 11 million-car problem elsewhere for Volkswagen. How they're resolving those, obviously, is outside the scope of the Court's inquiry.

But it's important that the decision-maker know that if

they can't come to a resolution within the time period prescribed by the Court, there will be certain things that will happen.

And it seems to me that all you have to do -- and I'm not telling you how to practice law, but show them the complaint and show them the discovery schedule, and explain to them that that is going forward, that is proceeding; and, therefore, it is in their interests sooner rather than later.

And I'm defining what "sooner" means. The Court is doing that. And whether I'm reasonable, unreasonable, I don't know. I try to be reasonable. But it looks to me like six months is enough time to make those types of determinations at least initially.

Now I turn to the government, and I say to the government, there's a concurrent responsibility with respect to the government. And that is that they must address this problem with the necessary resources in order to be responsive to Volkswagen in an expedited way.

I don't want to hear, "Well, we've given this to the government, and we don't have a response from the government."

And, you know, it's -- I've got a pretty good emissary.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: Talk to the government about this.

But I want to say that in some sense the Court represents the public. It's an independent branch that must weigh in on this matter. And then it expects the government to be responsive to Volkswagen to meet these types of deadlines.

In terms of the merits of any particular proposal, I have no opinion at this point. At some point I'm going to have to have some opinion, but I hope only after there is something resolved and I look at it and I get opinions as to whether or not it's an appropriate resolution. I'm not there yet because I've seen no resolution. And I want to see some efforts made to see whether or not we can arrive at a resolution.

So there is a deadline. And the deadline is before

March 24th. And I want to know -- I have no idea what you're

going to say then, but I want to know from the government and I

want to know from Volkswagen what exactly is the status of

attempts to offer remedial measures.

Because I think also, by the way, that Mr. Feinberg, his hands are tied. He cannot offer a protocol and -- he can't offer a protocol without the company saying, "These are the things that we can do." The company hasn't said that, as you advised me.

So we've stopped that process. And the only process that's going to go forward is the litigation process, unless Volkswagen and the government are able to achieve a resolution.

Now, it may be, because I'm not completely naive, it may be that there is no resolution between the government and EPA.

That's entirely possible. And, if so, Volkswagen then has to

determine what are the options; what's available to it; what are they going to offer.

As I said, this is a case in which liability has been conceded. The extent of which I'm not going to address. The circumstances I'm not going to address. But liability has been conceded; and, therefore, the question is the remedy. And there may be different remedies that VW has to consider. And I want them to consider it as soon as possible, given the context of where we are. So thank you.

I'm not inviting you to comment. I'm inviting you to communicate to your client.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: And I feel confident that will take place.

MR. GIUFFRA: Your Honor, it will happen immediately after the hearing.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

MR. GIUFFRA: Thank you.

THE COURT: Now let's turn to the agenda.

The Court has received, before it commented, a series of proposed pretrial orders, a discovery schedule, an order regarding motions to remand, and a stipulated protective order. I've reviewed those. They are entirely satisfactory. And the Court would enter them unless somebody wishes to comment on those documents.

There is also a proposed order with respect to state

actions, and I'm considering that. I don't need any discussion on that at this time.

I received a master case list. And I have received a proposed protocol for common benefit work and expenses. Thank you. It's very good. It will be the model for many such cases. I think it probably was the model for other cases.

(Laughter)

THE COURT: But one of the advantages, obviously, of picking counsel who have done this in the past is that they understand that to set up a protocol for expenses and compensation, and so forth, at the outset saves countless hours at the end in trying to figure out what is fair and what is appropriate under the circumstances. So I want to thank again the plaintiffs, because that is a plaintiffs' matter, for doing that.

I think we've already addressed the issue for service on Bosch. If there are jurisdictional issues, that's something that can be brought to the attention of the Court.

But it may very well be something that can be worked out by the parties in connection with having deferred that issue pending further proceedings. I don't know. That's a matter that, obviously, Bosch and the plaintiffs' steering committee should discuss.

Yes.

MR. SLATER: Yes, Your Honor, Matt Slater. I don't

```
want to be misunderstood. We're not here accepting service on
 1
    behalf of Bosch.
 2
                         I understand --
              THE COURT:
 3
              MR. SLATER: Thank you. But we will engage in the
 4
 5
    plaintiffs --
              THE COURT: Engage with the plaintiffs because of
 6
 7
     course --
              MR. SLATER: Of course.
 8
              THE COURT: -- it's important that you do so. And you
 9
     may be able to postpone, ultimately, or at least initially,
10
11
     some of those issues in an effort to try to move this forward
     on the merits. That's a matter --
12
              MR. SLATER: We'll --
13
                          That's a matter that you should discuss.
14
              THE COURT:
15
              MR. SLATER: Thank you.
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
16
17
          So let me turn to you, Ms. Cabraser. Are there other
18
     issues that you wish to address?
              MS. CABRASER: Thank you, Your Honor, yes. Elizabeth
19
20
     Cabraser for plaintiffs. I will run through them very quickly,
21
     just some various items that are mentioned in the joint
22
    proposed agenda.
          And first, thank you, Your Honor, for thanking the
23
    plaintiffs' steering committee. They are sitting very quietly
24
     today, but they are not spectators in the process.
25
```

```
active participants, and everything --
 1
                          I would assume that some of them may have
 2
              THE COURT:
     said something during the course --
 3
          (Laughter)
 4
 5
              MS. CABRASER: Yes.
                                   And the fact that we have been
     able to come to court with mostly stipulated orders and a lot
 6
     accomplished today is entirely due to the efforts of the
 7
     plaintiffs' steering committee.
 8
          With respect to the resolution efforts, our contacts and
 9
     discussions with settlement master at least mirror those that
10
11
     Volkswagen counsel has mentioned. Obviously, they are
     confidential. But I can tell you literally it is a daily
12
13
     process.
          And we appreciate the deadline the Court has given.
14
15
     have done our best to outline the various scenarios, to cost
16
     them out, and will continue to refine that process.
17
          With respect to some of the organizational and
18
     housekeeping matters, we filed the consolidated complaints on
19
              On time, barely. And to expedite the --
     Monday.
20
              THE COURT:
                         If I had given you more time, would the
21
     complaint have been longer or shorter?
22
          (Laughter)
23
              MS. CABRASER: You know, I'm -- I'm not going to
     answer that. It would have had fewer typos --
24
25
          (Laughter)
```

MS. CABRASER: -- at least.

But to expedite the filing of that complaint as a consolidated complaint for the proceedings, we filed it directly into the MDL docket. It is styled as an original action for filing in the Northern District of California. The lead representatives are residents of the Northern District of California, this division. And so in due course we'll ask the Court to give us a civil action number in the proceedings. We didn't want to go through the regular filing process related to the Court and go through that process. And this way we were able to get it served immediately.

And thank you, Your Honor, for putting it on the website.

With respect to the website and with communications to the plaintiffs and class members in general, one of the items we referenced in our joint agenda was the prospect of a Rule 23(d) order regarding a mechanism for the Court to share case information with members of the proposed classes.

Obviously, the basic information is on the website. And that is public. But not all class members are aware of that. And so we have begun a discussion with the defendants that would enable us to bring to the Court for consideration a proposed order and a proposed letter to the class members that establishes that direct line of communication; advises them of the website; gives them the basic information about the existence of these proceedings.

The defendants do communicate in a standardized way with the classes. And we're not suggesting that that is improper.

These are customers of the defendants.

Those letters don't advise on this litigation or reference its existence. And, again, we're not suggesting that's improper. But we are suggesting, given the fact that the class is very interested in this litigation and the resolution of this problem, and what their rights and abilities are to participate, that it would make sense, we believe, for the Court, if it so chooses, utilizing the same list that defendants have and use to make that direct communication.

That can be done by defendants using their lists. It can be done by giving the lists to a third party. Those would only be used for court-authorized communications.

But it would begin the process of keeping everyone in the class advised in a very contemporaneous way of what we're doing. We're trying to make this as public and transparent a proceeding as we possibly can. And I think giving the class members the website, for example, enables them to follow along in real time.

So we're not asking for a ruling today. Obviously, we have to --

THE COURT: I think it's a good idea if you would forward -- if you haven't done already -- a proposed letter to defense for their comments as to what you would like them to

send or some third party to send.

I'm perfectly satisfied with defense sending out this letter. But I need some comments from the defense as to --

MS. CABRASER: Sure.

THE COURT: -- both the propriety of it and the content. Maybe you can agree on the content and have somewhat of a disagreement on the propriety or the necessity.

Let me just point out, though, that one of the problems that occurs in MDL cases -- and telling you this is somewhat ironic -- is that there is a proliferation of state actions. And people have a right to file wherever the appropriate -- under venue requirements and jurisdiction and so forth.

Nevertheless, there is a great advantage to trying to have as much coordination and as much awareness of all customers that there is this litigation ongoing, and what it is about, and whether if they are to follow it or join it it's in their interests to do so. So I think in the interests of -- from an informational point of view, which ultimately leads to certain consequences in terms of the participation, it makes some sense.

Nevertheless, if there is a concern -- and I think it's a good idea to get the letter to them because maybe once they see the letter there either may or may not be a concern. And, as I said, it seems to me perfectly satisfactory if Volkswagen sends it out, if they wish. Maybe they don't have to. It can be

some third party. But, as I say, the devil is in the details.

Look at the letter and see where you are at that point.

I will be available to hear this on an expedited basis --

THE COURT: -- because if there is a prophylactic effect of having this information out there, I would rather do it sooner than later.

MS. CABRASER: Great.

MS. CABRASER: Thank you, Your Honor. We will proceed with that process.

Along the same lines, we are also discussing a potential tolling agreement. Even though under the federal class action equitable tolling doctrine the class allegations toll statutes of limitations for defined class members, we think it will also help people understand whether or not they need to file their own cases if we have a tolling agreement with respect to the state law claims, for example.

This is done in many MDLs. And I think it's particularly appropriate here. We're getting many questions from class members: Do I have to file my own action? Do I have to do something to join the class action? Et cetera.

These are procedural questions that are familiar to us but they are not familiar to the class members. So having a tolling order in place reassures folks that they don't need to do something individual, and will help control a proliferation of state court actions.

With respect to coordination, we do have a brief report on the California Judicial Council coordination proceedings. A coordination order was just entered you, I believe, yesterday. We'll get that to Your Honor if you don't already have it.

I believe the cases were assigned to Judge Mary Wiss, here in San Francisco -- or over there in San Francisco County Superior Court. And it's our view that there ought to be a close coordination. Obviously, that's up to Your Honor to meet with Judge Wiss.

But, obviously, we can share discovery and we can try to stay on the same schedule. We are doing the same sorts of outreach with respect to other collections of state court actions.

There are parallel class proceedings in Canada involving the same cars. This is a North America market at least with respect to the U.S. and Canada.

There is a leadership order in the Canadian proceedings in Ontario. And the co-lead and liaison counsel have communicated to us that they are generally desirous to coordinating with respect to discovery, to coordinating between judges, to the extent appropriate. That has been a very preliminary discussion.

And we can provide Your Honor with the orders from the Canadian proceedings. Obviously, they're at the complaint stage as we are. But I think it would be a great savings of

time and effort to utilize the same discovery under appropriate protective orders.

And, of course, on the resolution side these are the same models of vehicles sold under the same marketing campaign, with emission standards that are very, very similar to those adopted in the U.S. So Canada is much more like the U.S. than the European Union countries in that regard.

So that's where we are on transborder coordination with respect to Canada.

We submitted Pretrial Order Number 9, the discovery plan.

It's obviously a compromise of views with respect to timing.

It was -- I won't say -- it was hard fought in a very civil way and hard won.

The ability to progress from documents to depositions and to trial is going to depend on some determinations of some very basic matters involving the German privacy laws with respect to ESI.

We have an ESI vendor in place. We have translation services in place. We're going to work to the closest possible extent with DOJ Civil in that regard.

If Your Honor would like a report or update on the German privacy issue, we would defer to the DOJ on that. We're told there may be a solution to that coming soon.

But, obviously, our decision on the litigation front would be to move from documents to depositions to any trial

proceedings as soon as we can.

So the fact that we have an ultimate document deadline at the end of this year does not mean necessarily, and in plaintiffs' view, at least, should not mean that we can't proceed through the rest of the case during document process.

There's prioritized discovery. We expect to receive -- to start receiving the documents that have been produced to the government within 48 hours of this court's entry of the protective order. So that process is starting.

We have rolling deadlines for the rest of the discovery. In -- in the order. But we do expect, if we can't resolve issues that enable us to expedite the custodial deposition process, the fact deposition process, and the expert process, to be able to come to either Your Honor or Judge Corley for a resolution of disputes.

We're not, obviously, ready in the process to do that today. We thought it was better to reach basic agreement on what can happen and then hopefully expedite various aspects of the pretrial process as we go along.

So unless Your Honor has any other questions -- oh, and, yes, in terms of coordination with the state agencies, we were able to have a series of telephonic and in-person meetings with the California attorneys general staff handling the civil actions and the environmental actions.

Ms. Weaver can give you a short report on that process, if

```
you would like.
 1
                          I would.
 2
              THE COURT:
                                    Thank you.
          Thank you, Ms. Cabraser.
 3
              MS. WEAVER: Good morning, Your Honor.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Good morning.
              MS. WEAVER: So, of course, without waiving any common
 6
     interest or joint prosecutorial privileges, I can tell you that
 7
     we have met with the California Attorney General's Office both
 8
     on its own behalf on behalf of the attorney general and the Air
 9
     Resources Board. We anticipate, speaking on behalf of the PSC,
10
11
     cooperation going forward.
          I can say there have, as you are aware, been public
12
     reports of concerns around the German privacy law and the
13
     production of documents. And I can say it is the PSC's opinion
14
15
     that all parties on the plaintiffs' side would benefit by the
16
     production of those responsive documents so we can move
17
     forward.
18
          That is what I can say at this time. It is my hope on
19
     March 24th we will be talking more about results and less about
20
     process.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
22
          Any further comments from plaintiffs' steering committee?
23
     Does anyone -- Mr. Boise.
                                Yes.
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
24
              MR. BOIES:
25
              THE COURT:
                          Sure.
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
One item on the agenda is Jones Day
         MR. BOIES:
documents, the Jones Day issue. And that's a little bit
cryptic. But what it has to do with is --
                     Jones Day is conducting for Volkswagen an
         THE COURT:
internal investigation. And that's what you want to address?
         MR. BOIES:
                    Exactly, Your Honor.
         THE COURT:
                    Okay.
        MR. BOIES: And it has to do with the expedition of
document production.
    As Ms. Cabraser says, Pretrial Order Number 9 represented
a compromise of where we thought we would like to be and they
would like to be. And I think it is a reasonable compromise.
    But it's dependent on our ability to really conduct the
remainder of the pretrial work during this year while discovery
is still going on. That is, in turn, dependent on our ability
to get the documents that are easily accessible.
     There are a very large quantity, I'm told, in the
neighborhood of 100 terabytes of data that have been made
available to Jones Day --
                     I quess that's a lot.
         THE COURT:
     (Laughter)
                    That is a lot. That is a lot.
         MR. BOIES:
         THE COURT:
                    "Tera" seems to suggest a lot.
         MR. BOIES:
                     Exactly.
                    And something I don't want to have to look
         THE COURT:
```

1 at. 2 (Laughter) MR. BOIES: Mega --3 I've mastered enough of technology just to 4 THE COURT: 5 understand that aspect. MR. BOIES: I've gone through a stage where mega was a 6 7 lot. And then giga was even more. And now tera --What will be the next generation? 8 THE COURT: MR. BOIES: Some younger person knows --9 (Laughter) 10 -- but I don't. 11 MR. BOIES: But this is a very large quantity of material. We would 12 like to get access to it immediately. We believe that it has 13 been given for this process; it can be given for our process. 14 15 There are some German privacy issues that have to be 16 addressed. But we are prepared if necessary -- we don't think 17 it should be necessary. It would be a terrible waste. But if 18 necessary we'll go to Germany and review the documents there if 19 we have to do that. Because so much of it is going to be done 20 with computer-assisted review, that is a practical solution if 21 we have to do it. 22 But we want to get -- we want to get access to that 23 There are, like, 82 custodians whose materials have material. been made available to Jones Day. We want to have access to 24 25 those records. And we want to have that done promptly.

THE COURT: Do you know whether Jones Day has these documents in the United States?

MR. BOIES: My understanding is that they do not. My understanding is that Jones Day -- but that's an imperfect understanding, and defendant really needs to address that.

THE COURT: And Jones Day is not here at this proceeding.

MR. BOIES: They are not. Although, this is not, I think, something against Jones Day.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BOIES: We're just trying to get the Volkswagen documents.

THE COURT: That's right.

Well, I guess I have a couple of things to say. Number one, overall, I favor, strongly favor disclosure under appropriate safeguards of privacy concerns. But disclosure nevertheless.

Number two, I am in favor of doing things expeditiously rather than postponing it for some long period of time because I think that the value, then, of the information diminishes over time. And it takes you into very different directions that had you had this information at the outset you would not have had the necessity of pursuing certain avenues.

After having said that, I would like you, Mr. Boise, or members of your committee, to meet with Volkswagen to see

whether or not there can be some agreement as to those concerns. And if not, I'll rule on it. And I'm prepared to hear it on the 24th. So there's a deadline.

And, you know, in terms of filing documents just -- I always like to let lawyers work out their own schedules. And I know we have a series of rules; 35 days and so forth. As far as I'm concerned, see if you can work it out, okay, in terms of addressing these issues.

And I think, Mr. Giuffra, do you want to respond to that?

MR. GIUFFRA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GIUFFRA: I was a bit perplexed by Mr. Boise's comments because I thought we had worked this particular issue out.

In Proposed Pretrial Order 9, which Your Honor has before you, we are, as Ms. Cabraser indicated, to start producing documents within 48 hours. And we will do so. And there will be tens of thousands of documents.

And the plan is that within two days we produce all what we're calling the U.S. prior productions. And then on May 15 -- April 15, tax day, we begin producing non-U.S. prior productions to government agencies.

And so the plan is -- and we've agreed to begin producing the very documents that Mr. Boise is talking about pursuant to a schedule.

I would add -- and this is an important caveat -- there is a carve-out in Pretrial Order Number 9 that was negotiated with the plaintiffs' steering committee and in consultation with the United States government.

And Your Honor, as a former prosecutor, knows that the prosecutors don't like private plaintiffs and people, sort of, front-running their investigation. And there is obviously a criminal investigation here.

And so my point, Your Honor, is the carve-out that we reached is that to the extent we are producing documents pursuant to subpoena, to the criminal authorities, those documents are treated differently than documents otherwise.

But the documents are Volkswagen documents. And, ultimately, they will receive all of the documents.

Jones Day, just to put it on the record, has been retained by the supervisory board of Volkswagen. It's conducting an independent investigation. It is being directed by a six-member special committee.

Jones Day has been directed to proceed as quickly as possible. And they are doing so. They've also been told they must cooperate with the U.S. Department of Justice. And they are doing so.

The U.S. Department of Justice wants that cooperation to be done in a confidential way because they have their own law enforcement considerations.

It's not a situation where, well, if you produce the documents to the Department of Justice, you know, they'll never get it. Of course they will get the documents. It's just a question of timing and dealing with all of the competing considerations.

So I really think that this is something that's a nonissue. It's provided for in the pretrial order. And, as I said, on tax day they will be getting German documents.

Just to add a couple of other points, we have been working well with the plaintiffs' steering committee. We have agreed on everything. There's no disputes before the Court. We have agreed, on all the issues that Ms. Cabraser raised, to meet and confer with them. And I'm hopeful that we can reach agreements as long as both sides are reasonable.

On this question of German data privacy that was raised, I think that's an issue that will be resolved. And they will see that it is being resolved. There has been a lot of effort on the German side.

And, again, you know, we have tended to be very parochial in the United States. Well, in Germany and Europe data privacy is a very, very big thing. In fact, there are criminal laws that deal with data privacy in Germany.

And in this particular case the issue is the following:

Volkswagen allows its employees to use the Volkswagen computer

system for personal communications. As a result, under German

law, that makes it a data -- it makes it a -- sort of similar to Google or AT&T, it's all communications provider.

You can't, under German law, without violating German criminal law, just willy-nilly produce documents that are on such a telecommunications system.

That being said, we have, with a lot of work by German lawyers, U.S. lawyers, and also in consultation with government agencies, established a protocol whereby employees will consent to the transfer of data to the United States.

If an employee refuses -- and so far no one has -- counsel and discovery consultants will sit with that employee, and searches will be done and data will be segregated.

To the extent there will be any redactions, it's going to be sensitive personal information. You know, someone's racial or ethnic origin, health, something like that. And through the protocol we're hopeful we can work this all out.

We've agreed in the document that's before the Court to have a meet and confer with the other side on St. Patrick's Day to discuss the German data privacy issues. So I really think there will not be any issue.

We've been operating under the principle: cooperate with the plaintiffs; avoid unnecessary issues.

We obviously have a lot of stakeholders here, from the Department of Justice; the state attorneys generals; EPA; CARB; plaintiffs' lawyers in the United States; regulators outside

the United States. We are trying to balance all those issues.

And I think, ultimately, Your Honor, we want to get to a resolution as quickly as possible. And we are working very, very hard at all levels in the company to do so.

I think today the fact there were no disputes is reflective of the fact that at the highest levels in the company they have told us to cooperate, be reasonable, and try to work everything out so that we can move this matter forward.

And, ideally, Your Honor, we would like to avoid litigation. We would like to resolve the litigation. And we would like Director Mueller to be the person who, along with the Court, has -- has resulted in a global U.S. resolution with regulators and, also, plaintiffs lawyers.

And if that's not possible, we are very much prepared to go forward if we get the relevant approvals from EPA and CARB with Mr. Feinberg's protocol.

And he has received many, many options from Volkswagen of different resolutions. It's just a question of getting EPA and CARB approval, and then we can go forward. Obviously, the devil is in the detail.

THE COURT: Well, okay. Let me make a couple of observations.

First, I don't feel I'm in any position to decide this issue today. That's number one.

Number two, I certainly do appreciate the fact that you've

been able to resolve a number of issues in a collegial way, which require the cooperation of Volkswagen and the plaintiffs in doing so. And I think that there's an important concern for the Court that it proceed in that particular way.

I don't know whether this ultimately will be an issue or not. And I don't want to -- I don't want to comment on it until I see whether it is an issue or not. There may be some agreement and so forth in terms of timing, and whatnot, as to these particular documents. I appreciate all of that.

It's actually the last thing that you said that I want to comment on because you say, well, Volkswagen has given a number of protocols to Mr. Feinberg. And I'm sure that's true in the sense that here are some other options that we're considering.

MR. GIUFFRA: Right.

THE COURT: But what is meaningful is what ultimately Mr. Feinberg would release to the public as saying, "Here's the menu. Here are the options."I don't think he's in a position to do that today because I have been advised he is not.

So while a number of things are under consideration, I just want to come back to where I started, which is of course the end, which is that Volkswagen must make certain elections as to how they're going to proceed. Among them, I would suggest, would be precisely which protocols would be offered to the public. Having said that, I don't want -- it's in the context of everything else that I've said. And I just want to

urge you to take that message back.

And I think we understand -- at least the Court has an understanding; the public does too -- why Mr. Feinberg hasn't been able to proceed further as of today. But, hopefully, that will change.

MR. GIUFFRA: Rest assured, Your Honor, Mr. Feinberg is working very hard. And, again, we're working extremely hard with EPA and CARB. And I think that once we get a resolution with EPA and CARB on a remedy, I think everything will flow from there.

THE COURT: I do want to, once again, point out it may be that your resolution is not EPA's resolution. And I think if there is a difference by March 24th, as to the position of the parties, we have to address that. And we have to take action with respect to it.

So, you know, if in fact you're not able to arrive at an agreement -- and that's certainly possible -- then litigation will move forward quite quickly.

But I don't want to -- I don't want to be like King Lear.

You know, I will do such things. What they are, I know not

yet, but they will be the terrors of the earth.

That's not the Court's role. But it is the Court's role to set deadlines and to keep people on those deadlines. And that's what I'm trying to do today.

So thank you, Mr. Giuffra.

```
Thank you very much, Your Honor.
 1
              MR. GIUFFRA:
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Any comments?
                         Your Honor, can I just clarify one thing?
              MR. BOIES:
 3
              THE COURT:
                         Sure.
 4
 5
              MR. BOIES: And I totally appreciate this is not to be
     decided. And the reason for raising it was just to alert the
 6
     Court to the issue.
 7
          We will work with counsel for Volkswagen. And he's
 8
     entirely correct that we've had a lot of cooperation. But this
 9
     is a very important issue. And the documents that we're
10
11
     talking about are not the documents that have been provided for
     in what we agreed to.
12
13
              THE COURT: Let's debate that issue on the 24th, if we
    have to.
14
15
              MR. BOIES:
                         We will, Your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: Anyway, any further comment?
17
          All right. Thank you for your -- yes, Ms. Cabraser.
18
              MS. CABRASER: One last matter.
              THE COURT: Yes, of course.
19
20
              MS. CABRASER: This is not even -- this is just mega,
21
     just megabytes (indicating).
22
              THE COURT: Just megabytes, okay.
23
              MS. CABRASER: These are the corrected master case
     listings that --
24
25
              THE COURT: They will be deemed filed.
```

MS. CABRASER: 1 Okay. These are the correct ones. And a handy-dandy USB flash drive is included --2 THE COURT: Wonderful. 3 MS. CABRASER: -- at no extra cost. And thank you to 4 5 the defendants --THE COURT: I'm going to hold you to that "no extra 6 cost." 7 (Laughter) 8 THE COURT: I don't want to see that on the bill. 9 MS. CABRASER: We'll cover that one. Thank you. 10 11 THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you. We're in 12 recess now. 13 (At 9:03 a.m. the proceedings were adjourned.) 14 15 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript 17 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 18 DATE: Thursday, February 25, 2016 19 Kathering Sullivan 20 21 Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR 22 U.S. Court Reporter 23 24 25